

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/886,547 | 06/21/2001 | Catherine G. Bala | FIS9-2000-0416 | 7268 |

29154 7590 08/16/2004

FREDERICK W. GIBB, III
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC
2568-A RIVA ROAD
SUITE 304
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401

EXAMINER

LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2171

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/886,547

Applicant(s)

BALA ET AL.

Examiner

Etienne P LeRoux

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/26/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 13-21 and 23-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 13-21 and 23-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Finality Withdrawn

Applicant's Appeal Brief is persuasive. The finality of the previous Office Action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat No 5,950,190 issued to Yeager et al (hereafter Yeager).

Claims 1, 10 and 19:

Yeager discloses:

- creating a query form in said client workstation [Fig 4];
- receiving a worksheet form in response to said query form, said worksheet form defining selected tabular data [col 9, lines 50-60, col 6, line 59 through col 7, line 2]
- packaging said worksheet form to represent updated data for said tabular data stream, wherein said packaging of said worksheet form includes editing results of said query form [Fig 7]

- saving changes of data contained in said worksheet form in a database of said server [col 12, lines 45-67]

Claims 2 and 20:

Yeager discloses wherein said creating of said query form creates secure complex queries based on a selection of table, columns, and constraints maintained in a database of said server computer [col 2, line 47 through col 3, lines 20]

Claims 3 and 21:

Yeager discloses wherein said receiving of said worksheet grid form creates a snapshot from data in a database of said server [col 4, lines 2-10]

Claims 8, 16 and 26:

Yeager discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes allowing only tables, rows, and columns to be updated by authorized users [col 12, lines 45-60].

Claims 9 and 17:

Examiner maintains that further including automatically maintaining a current level of implementation of said worksheet grid form on said client workstation is inherent in the teachings of Yeager.

Claim 11:

Yeager discloses updating said database through said network by transmitting said worksheet grid form from aid client computer to said server computer [Fig 2, 33, 34]

Claim 13:

Yeager discloses wherein said updating of said tabular data includes selecting tabular data summarized by selected groups [col 32-53]

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeager in view of US Pat No 6,295,540 issued to Sanschagrin et al (hereafter Sanschagrin)

Claims 5, 13 and 23:

Yeager discloses the elements of claims 5, 10, 11 and 19 as noted above.

Yeager fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing reports capable of summarizing information by selected groups.

Sanschagrin discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing reports capable of summarizing information by selected groups [Fig 5]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yeager to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing reports capable of summarizing information by selected groups.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Yeager per the above for the purpose of summarizing differences in data between different situations which have been investigated.

Claims 6, 14 and 24:

Yeager discloses the elements of claims 1, 10 and 19 as noted above.

Art Unit: 2171

Yeager fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables.

Sanschagrín discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables [col 7, lines 43-51].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yeager to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables as taught by Sanschagrín.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Yeager per the above for the purpose of showing only discrepancies [col 7, line 47-51].

1. Claims 7, 15, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dimino in view of Pub No US 2003/0023609 issued to Della-Libera et al (hereinafter Della-Libera).

Claims 7, 15 and 25 :

Yeager discloses the essential elements of claims 1, 10, 11 and 19 as noted above.

Yeager fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables.

Della-Libera discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables [paragraph 22].

Art Unit: 2171

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yeager to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables as taught by Della-Libera.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Yeager per the above for the purpose of merging and/or copying rows in a related table [paragraph 0064]

2. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeager in view of US Pat No 6,567,915 issued to Guthery (hereinafter Guthery).

Claim 18:

Yeager discloses the elements of claim 10 as noted above.

Yeager fails to disclose partitioning the database into private and public databases.

Guthery discloses partitioning the database into private and public databases [col 6, lines 44-50].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yeager to include partitioning the database into private and public databases as taught by Guthery.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Yeager per the above for the purpose of dividing the database into confidential and non-confidential user information [col 6, lines 44-46] .

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeager in view of Pub No US 2002/0167543 issued to Smith et al (hereinafter Smith).

Claim 27:

Yeager discloses the elements of claim 19 as noted.

Yeager fails to disclose JAVA programming language.

Smith discloses JAVA programming language [paragraph 0040].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yeager to include JAVA programming language as taught by Smith.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Yeager per the above for the purpose of providing a platform independent language [paragraph 0040].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed in the Appeal Brief of 4/26/2004 have been considered and found partially persuasive. Ireland is silent regarding editing and saving changes. In the interests of expediting prosecution and avoiding unnecessary arguments regarding whether editing and saving changes is inherent is the disclosure of Ireland, examiner provides above new art rejection in order to clarify the issues for possible appeal.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne LeRoux whose telephone number is (703) 305-0620. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2171

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Etienne LeRoux

8/4/2004



UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER